Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/536,520	REMON ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Magali P. Slawski	1795
All Participants:	Status of Application:	_
(1) <u>Magali P. Slawski</u> .	(3)	
(2) Mr. James D. DeCamp.	(4)	
Date of Interview: 28 September 2010	Time:	
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ If Yes, provide a brief description:		
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed: 45, 55, 56, 61, 62 and 66		
Prior art documents discussed: Sugano et al. (US 4,416,606), henceforth Sugano		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet		
Part III.		
<ul> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.</li> </ul>		
(A	pplicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)

Application No. 10/536,520

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner proposed an examiner's amendment including the following changes:

- In claims 45 and 66, create a step (a) reciting an apparatus comprising multiple intermeshing screws. The purpose
  of this amendment was to clarify the fact that the screws belong to the apparatus as a whole and not just to the first
  transport zone.
- 2) In claims 45 and 66, substitute the limitation of co-rotating screws to a limitation of screws with flights that run parallel from screw to screw in the first transport zone. This change was meant to distinguish the claimed invention from Sugano, where the screws are able to co-rotate but where the flights run anti-parallel in the corresponding section.
- 3) In claim 66, further define the poorly soluble drug as being in a powder form. This change was meant to distinguish the claimed invention from the extrusion/granulation of viscous fluids.

After authorizing these changes, Applicant's representative further requested punctuation changes in the dependent claims to make the numbering of the steps consistent throughout the count. For example, all instances of step (e) were changed to step (f).